



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Teacher Leadership Competency and Global Readiness of Pre- Service Teachers
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The authors explore a highly relevant educational topic. While the premise holds potential, the manuscript requires substantial refinement to achieve rigorous publication standards.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title and Abstract The title requires more specificity about the institutional context to properly ground the research scope. The abstract describes a quantitative design but omits the sample size, while the conclusion severely overstates the practical impact of the correlation strength.
Introduction The jump between global challenges and the specific local context of Davao appears disjointed and requires smoother logical transitions. The literature section relies heavily on recent sources but lacks foundational theoretical synthesis to support the variables and justify the program selection.
Methodology The authors claim to use a stratified random sample selection but omit specific strata sizes for the 178 respondents, which obscures demographic representation. The paper also mentions



moderation analysis abruptly, as the abstract and results exclusively detail ANOVA and Pearson correlation. The data collection paragraph lacks critical details on ethical clearance protocols, respondent confidentiality, and informed consent procedures.

Results and Discussion

Tables 1 and 2 report completely identical standard deviations for multiple items, which raises severe questions about data integrity and potential calculation errors. The ANOVA results show a significant difference for leadership competency, but the discussion text fails to explain the precise pedagogical reasons for these program differences. The discussion must acknowledge that a correlation of .191 indicates a very weak relationship, contrary to the highly optimistic narrative presented by the authors.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The topic is relevant and the paper has possible value for teacher education. However, I still have serious concern on the conceptual validity and statistical evidence.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
I have major concern whether global readiness was really measured in this study. The instrument attributed to Abraham et al. (2021) was developed to measure pre-service teachers' preparedness, engagement, and self-efficacy in classroom teaching, not specifically global readiness. Yet the manuscript renamed its dimensions as global readiness and treats Relation, Knowledge, Strategies, Environment, Engage, and Self-efficacy as evidence of global preparedness. The cited original reference itself describes the scale as measuring preparedness, engagement and self-efficacy in classroom teaching. This creates a very fundamental construct validity problem. If the instrument is not actually measuring global readiness/global competence, then almost the entire findings, correlation, discussion, and conclusion concerning global readiness become questionable.
The claim that leadership competency differs according to teacher education program is statistically incomplete and presently cannot be properly evaluated. The manuscript gives only the omnibus ANOVA result, $F = 2.933$, $p = .022$, but the table does not present program-specific means, degrees of freedom, effect size, or any evidence showing which programs actually differ from one another. Despite this, later discussion gives rather detailed explanations about differences among BSEd-English, BSEd-Mathematics, BEED, BSNE, and BPE. At present, these program-level interpretations go beyond what the reported statistical evidence can establish.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			